



## Case Report

<b>1</b>	<b>Case Number</b>	<b>0281/13</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Advertiser</b>	<b>Honey Birdette</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Product</b>	<b>Lingerie</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>Type of Advertisement / media</b>	<b>Poster</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>Date of Determination</b>	<b>28/08/2013</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>DETERMINATION</b>	<b>Dismissed</b>

### ISSUES RAISED

- 2.2 - Objectification Exploitative and degrading - women
- 2.4 - Sex/sexuality/nudity S/S/N - general

### DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

Bombshell Rita dressed in a black and white bra and matching underpants and suspender belt with stockings. The window display includes the words Tasty Treats with a picture of an ice-cream.

### THE COMPLAINT

A sample of comments which the complainant/s made regarding this advertisement included the following:

*This is highly sexualised imagery supposedly advertising lingerie. The previous Honey Birdette advertising slogan read "Flash Me". Now we have "Tasty Treats". It is not a cafe, or a food store. It is a lingerie store and children will find it very confusing as to what is supposedly tasty about Bombshell Rita.*

*The poster is larger than life and I feel extremely uncomfortable walking past the store as does my husband and our male friends. I also feel it is highly inappropriate for children to be exposed to such sexual content without their parents ability to choose what they see and don't see in a public environment such as a shopping centre. I should also note that the store is less than 150 metres from the main children's play area and on a main thoroughfare between the play area and food court.*

### THE ADVERTISER'S RESPONSE

Comments which the advertiser made in response to the complainant/s regarding this advertisement include the following:

*No response received from advertiser.*

## **THE DETERMINATION**

The Advertising Standards Board (“Board”) considered whether this advertisement breaches Section 2 of the Advertiser Code of Ethics (the “Code”).

The Board noted the complainants’ concerns that the advertisement features sexualised and erotic imagery and is not appropriate for children to see.

The Board viewed the advertisement and noted the advertiser had not provided a response.

The Board considered whether the advertisement was in breach of Section 2.2 of the Code. Section 2.2 of the Code states: “Advertising or marketing communications should not employ sexual appeal in a manner which is exploitative and degrading of any individual or group of people.”

The Board noted the advertisement is featured on the windows of Honey Birdette lingerie stores and depicts a woman in matching lingerie and stockings with the text, “Tasty Treats!”

The Board noted that the lingerie the woman is wearing covers her private areas and considered that the pose of the woman is not overtly sexualised. The Board noted the use of the phrase, “Tasty Treats” in conjunction with the image of the woman in lingerie.

A minority of the Board considered that the advertisement is suggesting that the woman is a “tasty treat” and that this is both exploitative and degrading.

The majority of the Board however considered that the term “tasty treat” referred to the lingerie and not to the woman. The Board noted that the product is for women and that the styling and colours used are consistent with the candy coloured packaging which is aimed at the female market. The Board considered that the advertisement is aimed at women not men and that the use of a woman modelling lingerie to appeal to other women is not inappropriate and in this instance does not amount to an overall image which uses sexual appeal in a manner which is exploitative and degrading.

The Board determined that the advertisement did not breach Section 2.2 of the Code.

The Board considered whether the advertisement was in breach of Section 2.4 of the Code. Section 2.4 of the Code states: “Advertising or Marketing Communications shall treat sex, sexuality and nudity with sensitivity to the relevant audience”.

The Board noted the complainants’ concerns that children would see this advertisement and that it was not appropriate due to the sexualised nature of the image. The Board noted that the advertisement features a woman with one hand resting on her thigh and the other hand on

her hip. The Board noted the size of the advertisement and that its location in a shop window means it would be likely to be seen by children. A minority of the Board considered that the image was sexualised and not appropriate for a broad audience which would include children.

The majority of the Board noted that the style of lingerie is sexy but considered that the pose of the woman is not overtly sexualised and her private areas are well covered. The Board noted that some members of the community would prefer for this product to not be advertised in this manner however the majority of the Board considered that in this instance the reference to “tasty treat” does not make the advertisement more sexualised.

The Board considered that the advertisement is not inappropriate for children to see and does treat the issue of sex, sexuality and nudity with sensitivity to the relevant audience.

The Board determined that the advertisement did not breach Section 2.4 of the Code.

Further finding that the advertisement did not breach the Code on any grounds, the Board dismissed the complaint.